

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

JANICE HENNESSEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

RADIUS GLOBAL SOLUTIONS LLC et
al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-05654-DGE

ORDER DENYING MOTINO FOR
LEAVE TO FILE OVERLENGTH
BRIEF (DKT. NO. 29)

Plaintiff's renewed Motion for Leave to File an Overlength Brief (Dkt. No. 29) is DENIED. In her motion, Plaintiff describes a need to respond to Defendant's "non-analogous cases cited to distract the Court." (*Id.* at 1.) But, as the Court stated in its last order denying leave for an overlength brief (Dkt. No. 28), the desire to argue that an adversary's cases are inapplicable to the matter at hand is the same impetus that every litigant shares, and does not establish special need in this case for overlength briefing.

The purpose of the local rules establishing word limits is to push the parties towards offering their arguments in the most efficient manner possible, and to conserve the judiciary's

1 time and resources. *See* LCR 1(a) (stating that the purpose of the local rules is to “promote the
2 just, efficient, speedy, and economical determination of every action and proceeding”). That is why
3 over-length briefs are disfavored. *See* LCR 7(f). The Court appreciates Plaintiff’s “sincere
4 apology” (Dkt. No. 29 at 2) as she learns to navigate the mechanics of federal litigation, but the
5 word limits apply equally to *pro se* litigants and represented parties alike. To date, the Court has
6 not granted leave to any other party to file an overlength brief in this case, either.

7
8 Dated this 10th day of October, 2024.

9
10 

11 _____
David G. Estudillo
United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24